

REMARKS

The Applicant has amended Paragraph 0015; cancelled Claims 1-5 and 8; and amended Claims 6, 9-12, and 17; and added new Claims 24-26, which are supported by the application as originally filed.

REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIMS UNDER §102 – PART I

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Zane reference (US 3,907,184), and the Examiner has objected to Claims 6, 7, 9, and 17-23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-5 and 8, and has rewritten Claims 6, 9, and 17 in independent form. For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow Claims 6-7, 9, and 17-23.

REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIMS UNDER §102 – PART 2

The Examiner has rejected Claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Zane reference (US 3,907,184), and the Examiner has objected to Claims 14-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the Zane reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended Claim 10 or amended Claim 11. In particular, the Zane reference does not teach or suggest “A cargo system ... comprising: a container having a bottom surface adapted to be generally adjacent to the roof rack ... and an arm fastened to the bottom surface of the container....” of Claim 10. Further, the Zane reference does not teach or suggest “A cargo system ... comprising: a container having a bottom surface adapted to be generally adjacent to the roof rack; a first mount ... fastened to the bottom surface of the container....” of Claim 11. As best shown in FIGS. 3 and 4, the hinge 24 and locking means 34 are mounted to opposing side walls 25 and 27 of the cover 20. For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102 and allow Claims 10 and 11, and dependent Claims 13-16.

The Applicant further asserts that the Zane reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended Claim 12. In particular, the Zane reference does not teach or suggest Additionally, the Zane reference does not teach or suggest "A cargo system ... wherein pivotal movement of the arm ... biases the first mount against the first bar in a first direction and biases the second mount against the second bar in a second direction opposite to the first direction." of Claim 12. For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102 and allow Claim 12 and dependent Claims 24-26.

CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal contact would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contacts the Attorney of the Applicant at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 05 JAN 2006

By: 

Jeffrey Schox
Reg. No. 42,445
Attorney for the Applicant

Schox, PLC
209 North Main Street, #200
Ann Arbor, MI USA 48104
p: 734.355.0675
e: Jeff@SchoxPLC.com